



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,248	01/11/2002	Karine Ragil	PET-1710 C1	6990
23599	7590	03/05/2009	EXAMINER	
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. 2200 CLARENDON BLVD. SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201			NGUYEN, TAM M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte KARINE RAGIL,
SOPHIE JULLIAN, JEAN-PIERRE DURAND,
GERARD HOTIER and OLIVIER CLAUSE

Application No. 10/042,248
Technology Center 1700

Mailed: March 5, 2009

Before PAMELA S. BENNETT, *Review Team Paralegal.*

BENNETT, *Review Team Paralegal.*

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on January 21, 2009. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER, GROUNDS OF REJECTION

A review of the file finds that the grounds of rejection of the claims as provided in the Examiner's Answer mailed August 25, 2008 under the heading "Grounds of rejection" is not consistent with the grounds of rejection of claims set forth in the last Office action of record. The grounds of rejection of the claims as provided in the Examiner's Answer must be consistent with the last Office action of record, including any Advisory action responsive to any after final submissions. Each Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal must be identified and any new grounds of rejection must be provided under a separate heading "New Grounds of Rejection" in the Examiner's Answer and must include the approval of the TC Director or his/her designee. *See also Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 1207.02 and 1207.03 (8th ed. Rev. 6, Sept 2007)* for details.

A review of the Examiner's Answer finds a new Ground(s) of Rejection that has not been provided the required heading "New Grounds of Rejection" and/or which does not include the approval of the TC Director or his/her designee.

Specifically, the Examiner's Answer sets forth a rejection of claims 6-9, 11-26, and 29-41 as being "rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stem et al. (US 4,982,048)" [page 3]; whereas the last Office action, including any mailed Advisory Action(s) finds that "[c]laims 6-9, 11, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Stem et al. (US 4,982,048)" [page 3]. Correction of all Grounds of rejection for all claims is required.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the application is returned to the Examiner:

- 1) to vacate the Examiner's Answer mailed August 25, 2008;
- 2) to generate a new Examiner's Answer setting forth the correct Grounds of rejection and to correct other sections of the Answer as may be required;
- 3) to include the approval of the TC Director or his/her designee¹ (as required for any new grounds of rejection); and
- 4) for such further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

PSB

Millen, White, Zelano & Branigan, P.C.
2200 Clarendon Blvd.
Suite 1400
Arlington, VA 22201

¹ In Technology Center 1700, only a Director or Quality Assurance Specialist may approve new grounds of rejection.